

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RICHARD W. YOO and JANE Y. YOO,

Plaintiffs

v.

PROGRESSIVE DIRECT INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Defendant

Case No.: 2:24-cv-00409-APG-MDC

**Order Remanding Case for Lack of
Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

Defendant Progressive Direct Insurance Company removed this action based on diversity jurisdiction. ECF No. 1. However, Progressive did not identify its principal place of business, so I could not determine if complete diversity exists and Progressive did not show the amount in controversy requirement has been satisfied. Consequently, I ordered Progressive to show cause why this action should not be remanded to state court. ECF No. 4. Progressive did not timely respond to the order to show cause. Even if I considered Progressive's statement regarding removal as a response, it does not correct the identified deficiencies in the petition for removal. ECF No. 7.

I THEREFORE ORDER that this action is remanded to the state court from which it was removed for all further proceedings. The clerk of the court is instructed to close this case.

DATED this 26th day of March, 2024.



ANDREW P. GORDON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE